

Multi-Use Unidirectional Proxy Re-Signatures

Benoît Libert¹ and Damien Vergnaud²

¹ Université Catholique de Louvain, Crypto Group
Place du Levant, 3 – 1348 Louvain-la-Neuve – Belgium

² Ecole Normale Supérieure – C.N.R.S. – I.N.R.I.A.
45, Rue d’Ulm – 75230 Paris CEDEX 05 – France

Abstract. In 1998, Blaze, Bleumer, and Strauss suggested a cryptographic primitive named *proxy re-signatures* where a proxy turns a signature computed under Alice’s secret key into one from Bob on the same message. The semi-trusted proxy does not learn either party’s signing key and cannot sign arbitrary messages on behalf of Alice or Bob. At CCS 2005, Ateniese and Hohenberger revisited the primitive by providing appropriate security definitions and efficient constructions in the random oracle model. Nonetheless, they left open the problem of designing a *multi-use unidirectional* scheme where the proxy is able to translate in only one direction and signatures can be re-translated several times. This paper solves this problem, suggested for the first time 10 years ago, and shows the first *multi-hop unidirectional* proxy re-signature schemes. We describe a random-oracle-using system that is secure in the Ateniese-Hohenberger model. The same technique also yields a similar construction in the *standard model* (i.e. without relying on random oracles). Both schemes are efficient and require newly defined – but falsifiable – Diffie-Hellman-like assumptions in bilinear groups.

Keywords. Multi-use proxy re-signatures, unidirectionality, pairings.

1 Introduction

In 1998, Blaze, Bleumer and Strauss [8] proposed a cryptographic primitive where a semi-trusted proxy is given some information that allows turning Alice’s signature on a message into Bob’s signature on the same message. These *proxy re-signatures* (PRS) – not to be confused with proxy signatures [23] – require that the proxy be unable to sign on behalf of Alice or Bob on its own. The last few years saw a renewed interest in proxy re-cryptography [3–5, 17–19, 12].

This paper presents the first constructions of *multi-use unidirectional* proxy re-signature wherein the proxy can only translate signatures in one direction and messages can be re-signed a polynomial number of times. Our constructions are efficient and demand new (but falsifiable) Diffie-Hellman-related intractability assumptions in bilinear map groups. One of our contributions is a secure scheme in the standard model (i.e. without resorting to the random oracle model).

RELATED WORK. Alice – the delegator – can easily designate a proxy translating signatures computed using Bob’s secret key – the delegatee – into one that are valid w.r.t. her public key by storing her secret key at the proxy. Upon receiving Bob’s signatures, the proxy can check them and re-sign the message using Alice’s private key. The problem with this approach is that the proxy can sign arbitrary messages on behalf of Alice. Proxy re-signatures aim at securely enabling the delegation of signatures without fully trusting the proxy. They are related to proxy signatures, introduced in [23] and revisited in [16, 9, 22], in that any PRS can be used to implement a proxy signature mechanism but the converse is not necessarily true.

In 1998, Blaze *et al.* [8] gave the first example of PRS where signing keys remain hidden from the proxy. The primitive was formalized in 2005 by Ateniese and Hohenberger [5] who pinned down useful properties that can be expected from proxy re-signature schemes.

Blaze *et al.*’s construction is *bidirectional* (i.e. the proxy information allows “translating” signatures in either direction) and *multi-use* (i.e. the translation of signatures can be performed in sequence and multiple times by distinct proxies without requiring the intervention of signing entities). Unfortunately, Ateniese and Hohenberger [5] pinpointed a flaw in the latter scheme: given a signature/re-signature pair, anyone can

1. **Unidirectional**: re-signature keys can only be used for delegation in one direction;
2. **Multi-use**: a message can be re-signed a polynomial number of times;
3. **Private Proxy**: re-signature keys can be kept secret by an honest proxy;
4. **Transparent**: a user may not even know that a proxy exists;
5. **Unlinkable**: a re-signature cannot be linked to the one from which it was generated;
6. **Key optimal**: a user is only required to store a constant amount of secret data;
7. **Non-interactive**: the delegatee does not act in the delegation process;
8. **Non-transitive**: the proxy cannot re-delegate signing rights;

deduce the re-signature key that has been used in the delegation (*i.e.* the *private proxy* property is not satisfied). Another issue in [8] is that the proxy and the delegatee can collude to expose the delegator’s secret.

To overcome these limitations, Ateniese and Hohenberger proposed two constructions based on bilinear maps. The first one is a quite simple multi-use, bidirectional protocol built on Boneh-Lynn-Shacham (BLS) signatures [11]. Their second scheme is unidirectional (the design of such a scheme was an open problem raised in [8]) but single-use. It involves two different signature algorithms: *first-level* signatures can be translated by the proxy whilst *second-level* signatures cannot. A slightly less efficient variant was also suggested to ensure the privacy of re-signature keys kept at the proxy. The security of all schemes was analyzed in the random oracle model [7].

OUR CONTRIBUTIONS. Ateniese and Hohenberger left as open challenges the design of multi-use unidirectional systems and that of secure schemes in the standard security model. The present paper solves both problems:

- we present a simple and efficient system (built on the short signature put forth by Boneh *et al.* [11]) which is secure in the random oracle model under a reasonable extension of the Diffie-Hellman assumption;
- using an elegant technique due to Waters [27], the scheme is easily modified so as to achieve security in the standard model. To the best of our knowledge, this actually provides the first unidirectional PRS that dispenses with random oracles and thereby improves a recent bidirectional construction [25].

Both proposals additionally preserve the privacy of proxy keys (with an improved efficiency w.r.t. [5] in the case of the first one). They combine almost all of the above properties. As in prior unidirectional schemes, proxies are not completely transparent since signatures have different shapes and lengths across successive levels. The size of our signatures actually grows linearly with the number of past translations: signatures at level ℓ (*i.e.* that have been translated $\ell - i$ times if the original version was signed at level i) consist of about 2ℓ group elements. In spite of this blow-up, we retain important benefits:

- signers may want to tolerate a limited number (say t) of signature translations for specific messages. Then, if at most L translations are permitted in the global system, users can directly generate a signature at level $L - t$.
- the conversion of a ℓ^{th} level signature is indistinguishable from one generated at level $\ell + 1$ by the second signer. The original signer’s identity is moreover perfectly hidden and the verifier only needs the new signer’s public key.

The simplicity of our schemes makes them attractive for applications that motivated the search for multi-use unidirectional systems in [5]. One of them was to provide a proof that a certain path was taken in a directed graph: for instance, U.S. customs only need one public key (the one of the immigration agent who previously validated a signature on an e-passport) to make sure that a foreign visitor legally entered the country and went through the required checkpoints. Another application was the conversion of certificates where valid signatures for untrusted public keys can be turned into signatures that verify under trusted keys. As exemplified in [5], unidirectional schemes are quite appealing for converting certificates between *ad-hoc* networks: using the public key of network B’s certification authority (CA), the CA of network A can non-interactively compute a translation key and set up a proxy converting certificates from network B within its own domain without having to rely on untrusted nodes of B.

ROADMAP. In the forthcoming sections, we recall the syntax of unidirectional PRS schemes and the security model in section 2. Section 3 explains which algorithmic assumptions we need. Section 4 describes our random-oracle-using scheme. Section 5 details how to get rid of the random oracle idealization.

2 Model and Security Notions

We first recall the syntactic definition of unidirectional PRS schemes from [5].

Definition 1 (Proxy Re-Signatures). A (unidirectional) proxy re-signature (PRS) scheme for N signers and L levels (where N and L are both polynomial in the security parameter λ) consists of a tuple of (possibly randomized) algorithms (Global-Setup, Keygen, ReKeygen, Sign, Re-Sign, Verify) where:

Global-Setup(λ): is a randomized algorithm (possibly run by a trusted party) that takes as input a security parameter λ and produces a set of system-wide public parameters cp .

Keygen(cp): is a probabilistic algorithm that, on input of public parameters cp , outputs a signer's private/public key pair (sk, pk) .

ReKeygen(cp, pk_i, sk_j): on input of public parameters cp , signer i 's public key pk_i and signer j 's private key sk_j , this (ideally non-interactive) algorithm outputs a re-signature key R_{ij} that allows translating i 's signatures into signatures in the name of j .

Sign(cp, ℓ, sk_i, m): on input of public parameters cp , a message m , a private key sk_i and an integer $\ell \in \{1, \dots, L\}$, this (possibly probabilistic) algorithm outputs a signature σ on behalf of signer i at level ℓ .

Re-Sign($\text{cp}, \ell, m, \sigma, R_{ij}, pk_i, pk_j$): given common parameters cp , a level $\ell < L$ signature σ from signer $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ and a re-signature key R_{ij} , this (possibly randomized) algorithm first checks that σ is valid w.r.t pk_i . If yes, it outputs a signature σ' which verifies at level $\ell + 1$ under public key pk_j .

Verify($\text{cp}, \ell, m, \sigma, pk_i$): given public parameters cp , an integer $\ell \in \{1, \dots, L\}$, a message m , an alleged signature σ and a public key pk_i , this deterministic algorithm outputs 0 or 1.

For all security parameters $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$ and system-wide parameters cp output by **Global-Setup**(λ), for all couples of private/public key pairs (sk_i, pk_i) , (sk_j, pk_j) produced by **Keygen**(cp), for any $\ell \in \{1, \dots, L\}$ and message m , we should have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Verify}(\text{cp}, \ell, m, \text{Sign}(\text{cp}, \ell, sk_i, m), pk_i) &= 1; \\ \text{Verify}(\text{cp}, \ell, m, \text{ReSign}(\text{cp}, \ell, m, \text{Sign}(\text{cp}, \ell, sk_i, m), \text{ReKeygen}(\text{cp}, pk_i, sk_j)), pk_j) &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

To lighten notations, we sometimes omit to explicitly include public parameters cp that are part of the input of all but one algorithms.

The security model of [5] considers the following two orthogonal notions termed *external* and *insider security*.

External security: is the security against adversaries outside the system (that differ from the proxy and delegation partners). This notion demands that the next probability be a negligible function of the security parameter λ :

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[\{pk_i, sk_i\} \leftarrow \text{Keygen}(\lambda)]_{i \in [1, N]}, \\ (i^*, L, m^*, \sigma^*) \leftarrow \mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{O}_{\text{Sign}}(\cdot), \mathcal{O}_{\text{Resign}}(\cdot)}(\{pk_i\}_{i \in [1, N]}): \\ \text{Verify}(L, pk_{i^*}, m^*, \sigma^*) \wedge (i^*, m^*) \notin Q \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{O}_{\text{Sign}}(\cdot)$ is an oracle taking as input a message and an index $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ to return a first level signature $\sigma \leftarrow \text{Sign}(1, sk_i, m)$; the oracle $\mathcal{O}_{\text{Resign}}(\cdot)$ takes as input indices $i, j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ and a level ℓ signature σ and returns the output of $\sigma' \leftarrow \text{ReSign}(\ell, m, \sigma, \text{ReKeygen}(pk_i, sk_j))$; and Q denotes the set of (signer, message) pairs (i, m) queried to $\mathcal{O}_{\text{Sign}}(\cdot)$ or such that a tuple $(?, j, i, m)$, with $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, was queried to $\mathcal{O}_{\text{Resign}}(\cdot)$. This notion only makes sense if re-signing keys are kept private by the proxy.

Internal security: The second security notion considered in [5] strives to protect users, as much as possible, against dishonest proxies and colluding delegation partners. Three security guarantees should be ensured.

1. **Limited Proxy security:** this notion captures the proxy's inability to sign messages on behalf of the delegatee or to create signatures for the delegator unless messages were first signed by one of the latter's delegates. Formally, we consider a game where adversaries have all re-signing keys but are denied access to signers' private keys. The following probability should be negligible:

$$\Pr[\{pk_i, sk_i\} \leftarrow \text{Keygen}(\lambda)\}_{i \in [1, N]}, \{R_{ij} \leftarrow \text{ReKeygen}(pk_i, sk_j)\}_{i, j \in [1, N]}, \\ (i^*, L, m^*, \sigma^*) \leftarrow \mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{O}_{\text{Sign}}(\dots)}(\{pk_i\}_{i \in [1, N]}, \{R_{ij}\}_{i, j \in [1, N]}) : \\ \text{Verify}(L, pk_{i^*}, m^*, \sigma^*) \wedge m^* \notin Q]$$

where $\mathcal{O}_{\text{Sign}}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is an oracle taking as input a message and an index $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ to return a first level signature $\sigma \leftarrow \text{Sign}(1, sk_i, m)$ and Q stands for the set of messages m queried to the signing oracle.

2. **Delegatee Security:** informally, this notion protects the delegatee from a colluding delegator and proxy. Namely, the delegatee is assigned the index 0. The adversary is provided with an oracle returning first level signatures on behalf of 0 and is also granted access to re-signature keys¹ R_{0i} for all $i \neq 0$ (but not R_{i0} for any i). Her probability of success

$$\Pr[\{pk_i, sk_i\} \leftarrow \text{Keygen}(\lambda)\}_{i \in [0, N]}, \\ \{R_{ij} \leftarrow \text{ReKeygen}(pk_i, sk_j)\}_{i \in \{0, \dots, N\}, j \in \{1, \dots, N\}} \\ (L, m^*, \sigma^*) \leftarrow \mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{O}_{\text{Sign}}(0, \cdot)}(pk_0, \{pk_i, sk_i\}_{i \in [1, N]}, \{R_{ij}\}_{i \in \{0, \dots, N\}, j \in \{1, \dots, N\}}) : \\ \text{Verify}(L, pk_0, m^*, \sigma^*) \wedge m^* \notin Q],$$

where Q is the set of messages queried to $\mathcal{O}_{\text{Sign}}(0, \cdot)$, should be negligible.

3. **Delegator Security:** this notion captures that a collusion between the delegatee and the proxy should be harmless for the honest delegator. Namely, we consider a target delegator with index 0. The adversary is given private keys of all other signers $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ as well as *all* re-signature keys including R_{i0} and R_{0i} for $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. A signing oracle $\mathcal{O}_{\text{Sign}}(0, \cdot)$ also provides her with first level signatures for 0. Yet, the following probability should be negligible,

$$\Pr[\{pk_i, sk_i\} \leftarrow \text{Keygen}(\lambda)\}_{i \in [0, N]}, \{R_{ij} \leftarrow \text{ReKeygen}(pk_i, sk_j)\}_{i, j \in [0, N]}, \\ (1, m^*, \sigma^*) \leftarrow \mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{O}_{\text{Sign}}(0, \cdot)}(pk_0, \{pk_i, sk_i\}_{i \in [1, N]}, \{R_{ij}\}_{i, j \in [0, N]}) : \\ \text{Verify}(1, pk_0, m^*, \sigma^*) \wedge m^* \notin Q],$$

meaning she has little chance of framing user 0 at the first level.

An important difference between external and limited proxy security should be underlined. In the former, the attacker is allowed to obtain signatures on the target message m^* for signers other than i^* . In the latter, the target message cannot be queried for signature at all (knowing all proxy keys, the attacker would trivially win the game otherwise).

3 Bilinear Maps and Complexity Assumptions

BILINEAR GROUPS. Groups $(\mathbb{G}, \mathbb{G}_T)$ of prime order p are called *bilinear map groups* if there is a mapping $e : \mathbb{G} \times \mathbb{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{G}_T$ with the following properties:

1. bilinearity: $e(g^a, h^b) = e(g, h)^{ab}$ for any $(g, h) \in \mathbb{G} \times \mathbb{G}$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$;
2. efficient computability for any input pair;

¹ In non-interactive schemes, the adversary can compute those keys herself from pk_0 and sk_i , with $i \neq 0$, and the definition can be simplified. In the general case, they remain part of the adversary's input.

3. non-degeneracy: $e(g, h) \neq 1_{\mathbb{G}_T}$ whenever $g, h \neq 1_{\mathbb{G}}$.

In these groups, we assume the hardness of the well-known Computational Diffie-Hellman (CDH) problem which is to compute g^{xy} given g^x and g^y .

FLEXIBLE DIFFIE-HELLMAN PROBLEMS. Our signatures rely on new generalizations of the Diffie-Hellman problem. To motivate them, let us first recall the definition of the *2-out-of-3 Diffie-Hellman* problem [20].

Definition 2. *In a prime order group $\mathbb{G}$, the **2-out-of-3 Diffie-Hellman** problem (2-3-CDH) is, given (g, g^a, g^b) , to find a pair $(C, C^{ab}) \in \mathbb{G} \times \mathbb{G}$ with $C \neq 1_{\mathbb{G}}$.*

We introduce a potentially harder version of this problem that we call 1-Flexible Diffie-Hellman problem:

Definition 3. *The **1-Flexible Diffie-Hellman** problem (1-FlexDH) is, given $(g, A = g^a, B = g^b) \in \mathbb{G}^3$, to find a triple $(C, C^a, C^{ab}) \in (\mathbb{G} \setminus \{1_{\mathbb{G}}\})^3$.*

The unforgeability of our multi-use unidirectional proxy re-signatures is proved assuming the intractability of a relaxed variant of this problem where more flexibility is permitted in the choice of the base C for the Diffie-Hellman computation.

Definition 4. *The ℓ -Flexible Diffie-Hellman problem (ℓ -FlexDH) is, given $(g, A = g^a, B = g^b) \in \mathbb{G}^3$, to find a $(2\ell + 1)$ -uple*

$$(C_1, \dots, C_\ell, D_1^a, \dots, D_\ell^a, D_\ell^{ab}) \in \mathbb{G}^{2\ell+1}$$

where $\log_g(D_j) = \prod_{i=1}^j \log_g(C_i) \neq 0$ for $j \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$.

A given instance has many publicly verifiable solutions: a candidate $2\ell + 1$ -tuple $(C_1, \dots, C_\ell, D_1^a, \dots, D_\ell^a, T)$ is acceptable if $e(C_1, A) = e(D_1^a, g)$, $e(D_j^a, g) = e(D_{j-1}^a, C_j)$ for $j = 2, \dots, \ell$ and $e(D_\ell^a, B) = e(T, g)$. The ℓ -FlexDH assumption is thus falsifiable according to Naor's classification [24].

In generic groups, the general intractability result given by theorem 1 of [20] by Kunz-Jacques and Pointcheval implies the generic hardness of ℓ -FlexDH. For completeness, appendix A gives an adaptation of this result in generic *bilinear* groups.

Remark 1. The *knowledge-of-exponent assumption* (KEA1) [6] was introduced in 1991 by Damgård [14]. Roughly speaking, KEA1 captures the intuition that any algorithm which, given elements $(g, g^x) \in \mathbb{G}^2$, computes a pair $(h, h^x) \in \mathbb{G}^2$ must “know” $\log_g(h)$. Under KEA1, the intractability of the ℓ -Flexible Diffie-Hellman problem is easily seen to be boil down to the Diffie-Hellman assumption. Given (g, g^a) , an adversary outputting $(C_1, D_1^a) = (C_1, C_1^a)$ necessarily “knows” $t_1 = \log_g C_1$ and thus also $(C_2, C_2^a) = (C_2, (D_2^a)^{1/t_1})$ as well as $t_2 = \log_g C_2$, which in turn successively yields logarithms of $C_3, \dots, C_\ell$. Although the KEA1 assumption is inherently non-falsifiable, it holds in generic groups [15, 1] and our results can be seen as resting on the combination CDH+KEA1.

MODIFIED DIFFIE-HELLMAN PROBLEM. The second assumption that we need is that the CDH problem (g^a, g^b) remains hard even when $g^{(a^2)}$ is available.

Definition 5. *The **modified Computational Diffie-Hellman** problem ($mCDH$) is, given $(g, g^a, g^{(a^2)}, g^b) \in \mathbb{G}^4$, to compute $g^{ab} \in \mathbb{G}$.*

In fact, we use an equivalent formulation of the problem which is to find h^{xy} given $(h, h^x, h^{1/x}, h^y)$ (the equivalence is readily observed by defining $g = h^{1/x}$, $x = a$, $y = b/a$).

4 A Multi-Hop Scheme in the Random Oracle Model

To provide a better intuition of the underlying idea of our scheme, we first describe its single-hop version before extending it into a multi-hop system.

Our approach slightly differs from the one in [5] where signers have a “strong” secret and a “weak” secret that are respectively used to produce first and second level signatures. In our scheme, users have a single secret but first and second level signatures retain different shapes. Another difference is that our re-signature algorithm is probabilistic.

We exploit the idea that, given $g^b \in \mathbb{G} = \langle g \rangle$ for some $b \in \mathbb{Z}$, one can hardly generate a Diffie-Hellman triple (g^a, g^b, g^{ab}) without knowing the corresponding exponent a [14]. A valid BLS signature [11] ($\sigma = H(m)^x, X = g^x$) can be blinded into $(\sigma'_1, \sigma'_2) = (\sigma^t, X^t)$ using a random exponent t . An extra element g^t then serves as evidence that (σ'_1, σ'_2) actually hides a valid pair. This technique can be iterated several times by adding two group elements at each step. To translate signatures from signer i to signer j , the key idea is to have the proxy perform an appropriate change of variable involving the translation key during the blinding.

The scheme is obviously not strongly unforgeable in the sense of [2] (since all but first level signatures can be publicly re-randomized) but this “malleability” of signatures is not a weakness whatsoever. It even turns out to be a desirable feature allowing for the unlinkability of translated signatures w.r.t. original ones.

4.1 The Single Hop Version

In this scheme, signers’ public keys consist of a single group element $X = g^x \in \mathbb{G}$. Their well-formedness is thus efficiently verifiable by the certification authority that just has to check their membership in $\mathbb{G}$. This already improves [5] where public keys $(X_1, X_2) = (g^x, h^{1/x}) \in \mathbb{G}^2$ (g and h being common parameters) must be validated by testing whether $e(X_1, X_2) = e(g, h)$.

Global-setup(λ): this algorithm chooses bilinear groups $(\mathbb{G}, \mathbb{G}_T)$ of prime order $p > 2^\lambda$. A generator $g \in \mathbb{G}$ and a hash function $H : \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{G}$ (modeled as a random oracle in the security proof) are also chosen. Public parameters only consist of $\text{cp} := \{\mathbb{G}, \mathbb{G}_T, g, H\}$.

Keygen(λ): user i ’s public key is set as $X_i = g^{x_i}$ for a random $x_i \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p^*$.

ReKeygen(x_j, X_i): this algorithm outputs the proxy key $R_{ij} = X_i^{1/x_j} = g^{x_i/x_j}$ which allows turning signatures from i into signatures from j .

Sign($1, x_i, m$): to sign $m \in \{0, 1\}^*$ at level 1, compute $\sigma^{(1)} = H(m)^{x_i} \in \mathbb{G}$.

Sign($2, x_i, m$): to sign $m \in \{0, 1\}^*$ at level 2, choose $t \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p^*$ and compute

$$\sigma^{(2)} = (\sigma_0, \sigma_1, \sigma_2) = (H(m)^{x_i t}, X_i^t, g^t). \quad (1)$$

Re-Sign($1, m, \sigma^{(1)}, R_{ij}, X_i, X_j$): on input of $m \in \{0, 1\}^*$, the re-signature key $R_{ij} = g^{x_i/x_j}$, a signature $\sigma^{(1)} \in \mathbb{G}$ and public keys X_i, X_j , check the validity of $\sigma^{(1)}$ w.r.t signer i by testing $e(\sigma^{(1)}, g) = e(H(m), X_i)$. If valid, $\sigma^{(1)}$ is turned into a signature on behalf of j by choosing $t \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p^*$ and computing

$$\sigma^{(2)} = (\sigma'_0, \sigma'_1, \sigma'_2) = (\sigma^{(1)t}, X_i^t, R_{ij}^t) = (H(m)^{x_i t}, X_i^t, g^{tx_i/x_j})$$

If we set $\tilde{t} = tx_i/x_j$, we have

$$\sigma^{(2)} = (\sigma'_0, \sigma'_1, \sigma'_2) = (H(m)^{x_j \tilde{t}}, X_j^{\tilde{t}}, g^{\tilde{t}}). \quad (2)$$

Verify($1, m, \sigma^{(1)}, X_i$): this algorithm accepts if $e(\sigma^{(1)}, g) = e(H(m), X_i)$.

Verify($2, m, \sigma^{(2)}, X_i$): a second level signature $\sigma^{(2)} = (\sigma_0, \sigma_1, \sigma_2)$ is accepted for the public key X_i if the following conditions are true.

$$e(\sigma_0, g) = e(\sigma_1, H(m)) \quad e(\sigma_1, g) = e(X_i, \sigma_2)$$

Relations (1) and (2) show that translated signatures have exactly the same distribution as signatures directly produced by signers at level 2.

In comparison with the only known unidirectional PRS with private re-signing keys (suggested in section 3.4.2 of [5]), this one features shorter second level signatures that must include a Schnorr-like [26] proof of knowledge in addition to 3 group elements in [5]. On the other hand, signatures of [5] are strongly unforgeable unlike ours.

It is also worth mentioning that the above scheme only requires the 1-Flexible Diffie-Hellman assumption which is more classical than the general ℓ -FlexDH.

4.2 How to Obtain Multiple Hops

The above construction can be scaled up into a multi-hop PRS scheme if we iteratively apply the same idea several times. To prevent the linkability of signatures between successive levels $\ell + 1$ and $\ell + 2$, the re-signature algorithm performs a re-randomization using random exponents $r_1, \dots, r_\ell$.

Sign($\ell + 1, x_i, m$): to sign $m \in \{0, 1\}^*$ at the $(\ell + 1)^{\text{th}}$ level, user i chooses $(t_1, \dots, t_\ell) \xleftarrow{R} (\mathbb{Z}_p^*)^\ell$ and outputs $\sigma^{(\ell+1)} = (\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{2\ell}) \in \mathbb{G}^{2\ell+1}$ where

$$\sigma_0 = H(m)^{x_i t_1 \dots t_\ell}, \quad \begin{cases} \sigma_k = g^{x_i t_1 \dots t_{\ell+1-k}} & \text{for } k \in \{1, \dots, \ell\} \\ \sigma_k = g^{t_{k-\ell}} & \text{for } k \in \{\ell + 1, \dots, 2\ell\}. \end{cases}$$

Re-Sign($\ell + 1, m, \sigma^{(\ell+1)}, R_{ij}, X_i, X_j$): on input of a message $m \in \{0, 1\}^*$, the re-signature key $R_{ij} = g^{x_i/x_j}$, a valid $(\ell + 1)^{\text{th}}$ level signature

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^{(\ell+1)} &= (\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{2\ell}) \\ &= (H(m)^{x_i t_1 \dots t_\ell}, g^{x_i t_1 \dots t_\ell}, g^{x_i t_1 \dots t_{\ell-1}}, \dots, g^{x_i t_1}, g^{t_1}, \dots, g^{t_\ell}) \in \mathbb{G}^{2\ell+1} \end{aligned}$$

and public keys X_i, X_j , check the validity of σ under X_i . If valid, σ is turned into a $(\ell + 2)^{\text{th}}$ level signature on behalf of j by drawing $(r_0, r_1, \dots, r_\ell) \xleftarrow{R} (\mathbb{Z}_p^*)^{\ell+1}$ and computing $\sigma^{(\ell+2)} = (\sigma'_0, \dots, \sigma'_{2\ell+2}) \in \mathbb{G}^{2\ell+3}$ where

$$\sigma'_0 = \sigma_0^{r_0 \dots r_\ell} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} \sigma'_k = \sigma_k^{r_0 \dots r_{\ell+1-k}} & \text{for } k \in \{1, \dots, \ell\} \\ \sigma'_{\ell+1} = X_i^{r_0} \\ \sigma'_{\ell+2} = R_{ij}^{r_0} \\ \sigma'_k = \sigma_{k-2}^{r_{k-\ell-2}} & \text{for } k \in \{\ell + 3, \dots, 2\ell + 2\}. \end{cases}$$

If we define $\tilde{t}_0 = r_0 x_i / x_j$ and $\tilde{t}_k = r_k t_k$ for $k = 1, \dots, \ell$, we observe that

$$\sigma^{(\ell+2)} = (H(m)^{x_j \tilde{t}_0 \tilde{t}_1 \dots \tilde{t}_\ell}, g^{x_j \tilde{t}_0 \tilde{t}_1 \dots \tilde{t}_\ell}, g^{x_j \tilde{t}_0 \tilde{t}_1 \dots \tilde{t}_{\ell-1}}, \dots, g^{x_j \tilde{t}_0}, g^{\tilde{t}_0}, \dots, g^{\tilde{t}_\ell}) \in \mathbb{G}^{2\ell+3}$$

Verify($\ell + 1, m, \sigma^{(\ell+1)}, X_i$): the validity of $\sigma^{(\ell+1)} = (\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{2\ell}) \in \mathbb{G}^{2\ell+1}$ at level $(\ell + 1)$ is checked by testing if these equalities simultaneously hold:

$$\begin{aligned} e(\sigma_0, g) &= e(H(m), \sigma_1), & e(\sigma_\ell, g) &= e(X_i, \sigma_{\ell+1}) \\ e(\sigma_k, g) &= e(\sigma_{k+1}, \sigma_{2\ell-k+1}) & \text{for } k \in \{1, \dots, \ell - 1\} \end{aligned}$$

4.3 Security

Theorem 1. *The L -level scheme is a secure unidirectional proxy re-signature under the $(L - 1)$ -FlexDH and mCDH assumptions in the random oracle model.*

Proof. Limited proxy security. We show that an adversary $\mathcal{A}_1$ with advantage ε implies an algorithm $\mathcal{B}_1$ solving an $(L - 1)$ -FlexDH instance $(g, A = g^a, B = g^b)$ with probability $O(\varepsilon/q_s)$, where q_s is the number of signing queries made by $\mathcal{A}_1$.

System parameters: $\mathcal{A}_1$ is challenged on parameters $\{\mathbb{G}, \mathbb{G}_T, g, \mathcal{O}_H\}$ where $\mathcal{O}_H$ is the random oracle controlled by the simulator $\mathcal{B}_1$.

Public key generation: when $\mathcal{A}_1$ asks for the creation of user $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, $\mathcal{B}_1$ responds with a newly generated public key $X_i = A^{x_i} = g^{ax_i}$, for a random $x_i \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p^*$, which virtually defines user i 's private key as ax_i . For all pairs (i, j) , re-signature keys R_{ij} are calculated as $R_{ij} = g^{x_i/x_j} = g^{ax_i/ax_j}$.

Oracle queries: $\mathcal{A}_1$'s queries are tackled with as follows. Following a well-known technique due to Coron [13], a binary coin $c \in \{0, 1\}$ with expected value $1 - \zeta \in [0, 1]$ decides whether $\mathcal{B}_1$ introduces the challenge in the output of the random oracle or an element of known signature. For the optimal value of ζ , this introduces the loss factor $O(q_s)$ in the success probability.

- *Random oracle queries:* To respond to these queries, $\mathcal{B}_1$ maintains a list (referred to as the H -List) of tuples (m, h, μ, c) as follows:
 1. If the query m already appears in the H -List, then $\mathcal{B}_1$ returns h ;
 2. Otherwise, $\mathcal{B}_1$ generates a random bit c such that $\Pr[c = 0] = \zeta$;
 3. It picks uniformly at random $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}_p^*$ and computes $h = g^\mu$ if $c = 0$ and $h = B^\mu$ otherwise;
 4. It adds the 4-uple (m, h, μ, c) to the H -List and returns h as the answer to the random oracle query.
- *Signing queries:* when a signature of signer i is queried for a message m , $\mathcal{B}_1$ runs the random oracle to obtain the 4-uple (m, h, μ, c) contained in the H -List. If $c = 1$ then $\mathcal{B}_1$ reports failure and aborts. Otherwise, the algorithm $\mathcal{B}_1$ returns $h^{x_i a} = A^{x_i \mu}$ as a valid signature on m .

After a number of queries, $\mathcal{A}_1$ comes up with a message m^* , that was never queried for signature for any signer, an index $i^* \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ and a L^{th} level forgery $\sigma^{*(L)} = (\sigma_0^*, \dots, \sigma_{2L-2}^*) \in \mathbb{G}^{2L-1}$. At this stage, $\mathcal{B}_1$ runs the random oracle to obtain the 4-uple (m^*, h^*, μ^*, c^*) contained in the H -List and fails if $c^* = 0$. Otherwise, if $\sigma^{*(L)}$ is valid, it may be written

$$(\sigma_0^*, \dots, \sigma_{2L-2}^*) = \left(B^{\mu^* x_{i^*} a t_1 \dots t_{L-1}}, A^{t_1, \dots, t_{L-1}}, \dots, A^{t_1}, g^{t_1}, \dots, g^{t_{L-1}} \right)$$

which provides $\mathcal{B}_1$ with a valid tuple $(C_1, \dots, C_{L-1}, D_1^a, \dots, D_{L-1}^a, D_{L-1}^{ab})$, where $D_{L-1}^{ab} = \sigma_0^{*1/\mu^* x_{i^*}}$, so that $\log_g(D_j) = \prod_{i=1}^j \log_g(C_i)$ for $j \in \{1, \dots, L-1\}$. A similar analysis to [13, 11] gives the announced bound on $\mathcal{B}_1$'s advantage if the optimal probability $\zeta = q_s/(q_s + 1)$ is used when answering hash queries.

Delegatee security. We also show how to break the $(L-1)$ -FlexDH assumption out of a delegatee security adversary $\mathcal{A}_2$. Given an input pair $(A = g^a, B = g^b)$, the simulator $\mathcal{B}_2$ proceeds as $\mathcal{B}_1$ did in the proof of limited proxy security.

System parameters and public keys: the target delegatee's public key is set $X_0 = A = g^a$. For $i = 1, \dots, n$, other public keys are defined as $X_i = g^{x_i}$ for a random $x_i \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p^*$. To generate re-signature keys R_{ij} , $\mathcal{B}_2$ sets $R_{ij} = g^{x_i/x_j}$ when $i, j \neq 0$ and $R_{0j} = A^{1/x_j} = g^{a/x_j}$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$.

Queries: $\mathcal{A}_2$'s hash and signing queries are handled exactly as in the proof of limited proxy security. Namely, $\mathcal{B}_2$ fails if $\mathcal{A}_2$ asks for a signature on a message m for which $H(m) = B^\mu$ and responds consistently otherwise.

When $\mathcal{A}_2$ outputs her forgery $\sigma^{*(L)} = (\sigma_0^*, \dots, \sigma_{2L-2}^*)$ at level L , $\mathcal{B}_2$ is successful if $H(m^*) = B^{\mu^*}$, for some $\mu^* \in \mathbb{Z}_p^*$, and extracts an admissible $(2L-1)$ -uple as done in the proof of limited proxy security.

Delegator security. This security property is proven under the mCDH assumption. Given an adversary $\mathcal{A}_3$ with advantage ε , we outline an algorithm $\mathcal{B}_3$ that has probability $O(\varepsilon/q_s)$ of finding g^{ab} given $(g, A = g^a, A' = g^{1/a}, B = g^b)$.

Public key generation: as previously, the target public key is defined as $X_0 = A = g^a$. Remaining public keys are set as $X_i = g^{x_i}$ for a random $x_i \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p^*$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. This time, $\mathcal{A}_3$ aims at producing a first level forgery and is granted *all* re-signature keys, including R_{0j} and R_{j0} . For indexes (i, j) s.t. $i, j \neq 0$, $\mathcal{B}_3$ sets $R_{ij} = g^{x_i/x_j}$. If $i = 0$, it calculates $R_{0j} = A^{1/x_j} = g^{a/x_j}$. If $j = 0$ (and thus $i \neq 0$), $\mathcal{B}_3$ computes $R_{i0} = A'^{x_i} = g^{x_i/a}$ to $\mathcal{A}_3$.

Hash and signing queries are dealt with exactly as for previous adversaries. Eventually, $\mathcal{A}_3$ produces a first level forgery $\sigma^{*(1)}$ for a new message m^* . Then, $\mathcal{B}_3$ can extract g^{ab} if $H(m) = (g^b)^{\mu^*}$ for some $\mu^* \in \mathbb{Z}_p^*$, which occurs with probability $O(1/q_s)$ using Coron’s technique [13]. Otherwise, $\mathcal{B}_3$ fails.

External security. We finally show that an external security adversary $\mathcal{A}_4$ also allows breaking the $(L - 1)$ -FlexDH assumption almost exactly as in the proof of limited proxy security. The simulator $\mathcal{B}_4$ is given an instance $(g, A = g^a, B = g^b)$. As previously, $\mathcal{B}_4$ must “program” the random oracle H hoping that its output will be $H(m^*) = B^{\mu^*}$ (where $\mu^* \in \mathbb{Z}_p^*$ is known) for the message m^* that the forgery $\sigma^{*(L)}$ pertains to. The difficulty is that $\mathcal{B}_4$ must also be able to answer signing queries made on m^* for all but one signers. Therefore, $\mathcal{B}_4$ must guess which signer i^* will be $\mathcal{A}_4$ ’s prey beforehand. At the outset of the game, it thus chooses an index $i^* \xleftarrow{R} \{1, \dots, N\}$. Signer i^* ’s public key is set as $X_{i^*} = A = g^a$. All other signers $i \neq i^*$ are assigned public keys $X_i = g^{x_i}$ for which $\mathcal{B}_4$ knows the matching secret x_i and can thus always answer signing queries.

Hash queries and signing queries involving i^* are handled as in the proof of limited proxy security. When faced with a re-signing query from i to j for a valid signature $\sigma^{(\ell)}$ at level $\ell \in \{1, \dots, L\}$, $\mathcal{B}_4$ ignores $\sigma^{(\ell)}$ and simulates a first level signature for signer j . The resulting signature $\sigma'^{(1)}$ is then turned into a $(\ell + 1)^{\text{th}}$ level signature and given back to $\mathcal{A}_4$. A re-signing query thus triggers a signing query that only causes failure if $H(m)$ differs from g^μ for a known $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}_p^*$.

When $\mathcal{A}_4$ forges a signature at level L , $\mathcal{B}_4$ successfully extract a $(2L - 1)$ -Flexible Diffie-Hellman tuple (as $\mathcal{B}_1$ and $\mathcal{B}_2$ did) if $H(m^*) = (g^b)^{\mu^*}$ and if it correctly guessed the identity i^* of the target signer. If $\mathcal{A}_4$ ’s advantage is ε , we find $O(\varepsilon/(N(q_s + q_{rs} + 1)))$ as a lower bound on $\mathcal{B}_4$ ’s probability of success, q_s and q_{rs} being the number of signature and re-signature queries respectively. $\square$

5 Eliminating the Random Oracle

Several extensions of BLS signatures have a standard model counterpart when Waters’ technique supersedes random oracle manipulations (e.g. [21]). Likewise, we can very simply twist our method and achieve the first unidirectional PRS scheme (even including single hop ones) that avoids the random oracle model. *Mutatis mutandis*, the scheme is totally similar to our first construction and relies on the same assumptions.

5.1 The Single Hop Variant

As in [27], n denotes the length of messages to be signed. Arbitrary long messages can be signed if we first apply a collision-resistant hash function with n -bit outputs, in which case n is part of the security parameter.

The scheme requires a trusted party to generate common public parameters. However, this party can remain off-line after the setup phase.

Global-setup (λ, n) : given security parameters λ, n , this algorithm chooses bilinear groups $(\mathbb{G}, \mathbb{G}_T)$ of order $p > 2^\lambda$, generators $g, h \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{G}$ and a random $(n + 1)$ -vector $\bar{u} = (u', u_1, \dots, u_n) \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{G}^{n+1}$. The latter defines a function $F : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{G}$ mapping n -bit strings $\mathbf{m} = m_1 \dots m_n$ (where $m_i \in \{0, 1\}$ for all $i \in \{0, 1\}$) onto $F(\mathbf{m}) = u' \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n u_i^{m_i}$. The public parameters are

$$\text{cp} := \{\mathbb{G}, \mathbb{G}_T, g, h, \bar{u}\}.$$

Keygen (λ) : user i sets his public key as $X_i = g^{x_i}$ for a random $x_i \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p^*$.

ReKeygen (x_j, X_i) : given user j ’s private key x_j and user i ’s public key X_i , generate the re-signature key $R_{ij} = X_i^{1/x_j} = g^{x_i/x_j}$ that will be used to translate signature from i into signatures from j .

Sign $(1, \mathbf{m}, x_i)$: to sign a message $\mathbf{m} = m_1 \dots m_n \in \{0, 1\}^n$ at the first level, the signer picks $r \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p^*$ at random and computes

$$\sigma^{(1)} = (\sigma_0, \sigma_1) = (h^{x_i} \cdot F(\mathbf{m})^r, g^r)$$

Sign(2, $\mathbf{m}, x_i$): to generate a second level signature on $\mathbf{m} = m_1 \dots m_n \in \{0, 1\}^n$, the signer chooses $r, t \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p^*$ and computes

$$\sigma^{(2)} = (\sigma_0, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3) = (h^{tx_i} \cdot F(\mathbf{m})^r, g^r, X_i^t, g^t) \quad (3)$$

Re-Sign(1, $\mathbf{m}, \sigma^{(1)}, R_{ij}, X_i, X_j$): on input of a message $\mathbf{m} \in \{0, 1\}^n$, the re-signature key $R_{ij} = g^{x_i/x_j}$, a signature $\sigma^{(1)} = (\sigma_0, \sigma_1)$ and public keys X_i, X_j , check the validity of σ w.r.t signer i by testing if

$$e(\sigma_0, g) = e(X_i, h) \cdot e(F(\mathbf{m}), \sigma_1) \quad (4)$$

If $\sigma^{(1)}$ is a valid, it can be turned into a signature on behalf of j by choosing $r', t \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p^*$ and computing

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^{(2)} &= (\sigma'_0, \sigma'_1, \sigma'_2, \sigma'_3) = (\sigma_0^t \cdot F(\mathbf{m})^{r'}, \sigma_1^t \cdot g^{r'}, X_i^t, R_{ij}^t) \\ &= (h^{tx_i} \cdot F(\mathbf{m})^{r''}, g^{r''}, X_i^t, g^{tx_i/x_j}) \end{aligned}$$

where $r'' = tr + r'$. If we set $\tilde{t} = tx_i/x_j$, we observe that

$$\sigma^{(2)} = (\sigma'_0, \sigma'_1, \sigma'_2, \sigma'_3) = (h^{\tilde{t}x_j} \cdot F(\mathbf{m})^{r''}, g^{r''}, X_j^{\tilde{t}}, g^{\tilde{t}}) \quad (5)$$

Verify(1, $\mathbf{m}, \sigma^{(1)}, X_i$): the validity of a first level signature $\sigma^{(1)} = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2)$ is checked by testing if relation (4) holds.

Verify(2, $\mathbf{m}, \sigma^{(2)}, X_i$): a second level signature $\sigma^{(2)} = (\sigma_0, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3)$ is accepted for the public key X_i if the following conditions are true.

$$e(\sigma_0, g) = e(\sigma_2, h) \cdot e(F(\mathbf{m}), \sigma'_1) \quad (6)$$

$$e(\sigma_2, g) = e(X_i, \sigma_3) \quad (7)$$

To the best of our knowledge, the above scheme is the first unidirectional PRS in the standard model and solves another problem left open in [5] where all constructions require the random oracle model. Like the scheme of section 4, this extension of Waters' signature [27] is scalable into a multi-hop PRS.

5.2 The Multi-Hop Extension

At levels $\ell \geq 2$, algorithms Sign, Re-Sign and Verify are generalized as follows.

Sign($\ell + 1, \mathbf{m}, x_i$): to sign $\mathbf{m} \in \{0, 1\}^n$ at level $\ell + 1$, user i picks $r \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p^*$, $(t_1, \dots, t_\ell) \xleftarrow{R} (\mathbb{Z}_p^*)^\ell$ and outputs $\sigma^{(\ell+1)} = (\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{2\ell+1}) \in \mathbb{G}^{2\ell+2}$ where

$$\begin{cases} \sigma_0 = h^{x_i t_1 \dots t_\ell} \cdot F(\mathbf{m})^r \\ \sigma_1 = g^r \\ \sigma_k = g^{x_i t_1 \dots t_{\ell+2-k}} & \text{for } k \in \{2, \dots, \ell + 1\} \\ \sigma_k = g^{t_{k-\ell-1}} & \text{for } k \in \{\ell + 2, \dots, 2\ell + 1\}. \end{cases}$$

Re-Sign($\ell + 1, \mathbf{m}, \sigma^{(\ell+1)}, R_{ij}, X_i, X_j$): on input of a message $\mathbf{m} \in \{0, 1\}^*$, the re-signature key $R_{ij} = g^{x_i/x_j}$, a purported $(\ell + 1)^{\text{th}}$ level signature

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^{(\ell+1)} &= (\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{2\ell+1}) \\ &= (h^{x_i t_1 \dots t_\ell} \cdot F(\mathbf{m})^r, g^r, g^{x_i t_1 \dots t_\ell}, g^{x_i t_1 \dots t_{\ell-1}}, \dots, g^{x_i t_1}, g^{t_1}, \dots, g^{t_\ell}) \in \mathbb{G}^{2\ell+2} \end{aligned}$$

and public keys X_i, X_j , check the correctness of $\sigma^{(\ell+1)}$ under X_i . If valid, $\sigma^{(\ell+1)}$ is translated for X_j by sampling $r' \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p^*$, $(r_0, r_1, \dots, r_\ell) \xleftarrow{R} (\mathbb{Z}_p^*)^{\ell+1}$ and setting $\sigma^{(\ell+2)} = (\sigma'_0, \dots, \sigma'_{2\ell+3}) \in \mathbb{G}^{2\ell+4}$ where

$$\begin{cases} \sigma'_0 = \sigma_0^{r_0 \dots r_\ell} \cdot F(\mathbf{m})^{r'} \\ \sigma'_1 = \sigma_1^{r_0 \dots r_\ell} \cdot g^{r'} \\ \sigma'_k = \sigma_k^{r_0 \dots r_{\ell+2-k}} & \text{for } k \in \{2, \dots, \ell + 1\} \\ \sigma'_{\ell+2} = X_i^{r_0} \\ \sigma'_{\ell+3} = R_{ij}^{r_0} \\ \sigma'_k = \sigma_{k-2}^{r_{k-\ell-3}} & \text{for } k \in \{\ell + 4, \dots, 2\ell + 3\}. \end{cases}$$

If we define $\tilde{t}_0 = r_0 x_i / x_j$, $r'' = r_0 \cdots r_\ell + r'$ and $\tilde{t}_k = r_k t_k$ for $k = 1, \dots, \ell$, we observe that

$$\sigma^{(\ell+2)} = (h^{x_j \tilde{t}_0 \tilde{t}_1 \cdots \tilde{t}_\ell} \cdot F(\mathbf{m})^{r''}, g^{r''}, g^{x_j \tilde{t}_0 \tilde{t}_1 \cdots \tilde{t}_\ell}, g^{x_j \tilde{t}_0 \tilde{t}_1 \cdots \tilde{t}_{\ell-1}}, \dots, g^{x_j \tilde{t}_0}, g^{\tilde{t}_0}, \dots, g^{\tilde{t}_\ell})$$

Verify($\ell + 1, \mathbf{m}, \sigma^{(\ell+1)}, X_i$): a candidate signature $\sigma^{(\ell+1)} = (\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{2\ell+1})$ is verified by testing if the following equalities hold:

$$\begin{aligned} e(\sigma_0, g) &= e(h, \sigma_3) \cdot e(F(\mathbf{m}), \sigma_1) \\ e(\sigma_k, g) &= e(\sigma_{k+1}, \sigma_{2\ell+3-k}) \text{ for } k \in \{2, \dots, \ell\} \\ e(\sigma_{\ell+1}, g) &= e(X_i, \sigma_{\ell+2}) \end{aligned}$$

5.3 Security

Theorem 2. *The scheme with L levels (and thus at most $L - 1$ hops) is a secure unidirectional PRS under the $(L - 1)$ -FlexDH and mCDH assumptions.*

Proof. The proof is very similar to the one of theorem 1 and replaces random oracle manipulations by the tricks of [10, 27]. We prove the limited proxy and delegatee security properties under the $(L - 1)$ -FlexDH assumption. The delegator security is demonstrated under the mCDH assumption.

Limited proxy security. We consider an adversary $\mathcal{A}_1$ with advantage ε . We describe an algorithm $\mathcal{B}_1$ solving a $(L - 1)$ -FlexDH instance ($A = g^a, B = g^b$) with probability $\varepsilon/4q_s(n + 1)$, where q_s is the number of signing queries made by $\mathcal{A}_1$, within a comparable time.

System parameters: The simulator $\mathcal{B}_1$ prepares common public parameters as follows. It first sets $h = B = g^b$. The $(n + 1)$ -vector $\bar{u} = (u', u_1, \dots, u_n)$ is defined by choosing $u' = h^{w' - \kappa\tau} \cdot g^{z'}$ and $u_i = h^{w_i} \cdot g^{z_i}$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ using random vectors $(w', w_1, \dots, w_n) \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_\tau^{n+1}$, $(z', z_1, \dots, z_n) \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p^{n+1}$, where $\kappa \xleftarrow{R} \{0, \dots, n\}$ is randomly chosen and $\tau = 2q_s$. For any message $\mathbf{m} = m_1 \dots m_n \in \{0, 1\}^n$, we have

$$F(\mathbf{m}) = u' \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n u_i^{m_i} = h^{J(\mathbf{m})} g^{K(\mathbf{m})}$$

for functions $J : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$, $K : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_p$ respectively defined as $J(\mathbf{m}) = w' + \sum_{i=1}^n w_i m_i - \kappa\tau$ and $K(\mathbf{m}) = z' + \sum_{i=1}^n z_i m_i$. As in [27], $\mathcal{B}_1$ will be successful if $J(\mathbf{m}^*) = 0$ for the message $\mathbf{m}^*$ of the forgery stage whereas $J(\mathbf{m}) \neq 0$ for all messages $\mathbf{m} \neq \mathbf{m}^*$ queried for signature. Since $|J(\cdot)| \leq \tau(n + 1) \ll p$, we have $J(\mathbf{m}^*) = 0$ with non-negligible probability $O(1/\tau(n + 1))$. The adversary $\mathcal{A}_1$ is challenged on parameters $(g, h, \bar{u})$.

Key generation: for user $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, $\mathcal{B}_1$ defines a public key as $X_i = A^{x_i} = g^{ax_i}$, for a random $x_i \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p^*$, which virtually defines user i 's private key as ax_i . For pairs (i, j) , re-signature keys are chosen as $R_{ij} = g^{x_i/x_j} = g^{ax_i/ax_j}$.

Signing queries: when a signature of signer i is queried for a message $\mathbf{m}$, $\mathcal{B}_1$ fails if $J(\mathbf{m}) = 0 \pmod p$. Otherwise, following the technique of [10, 27], it can construct a signature by picking $r \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p$ and computing

$$\sigma = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2) = \left(X_i^{-\frac{K(\mathbf{m})}{J(\mathbf{m})}} \cdot F(\mathbf{m})^r, X_i^{-\frac{1}{J(\mathbf{m})}} \cdot g^r \right).$$

which is returned to $\mathcal{A}_I$. If we define $\tilde{r} = r - (ax_i)/J(\mathbf{m})$, σ has the correct distribution as

$$\sigma_1 = X_i^{-\frac{K(\mathbf{m})}{J(\mathbf{m})}} \cdot F(\mathbf{m})^r = X_i^{-\frac{K(\mathbf{m})}{J(\mathbf{m})}} \cdot F(\mathbf{m})^{\tilde{r}} \cdot (h^{J(\mathbf{m})} \cdot g^{K(\mathbf{m})})^{\frac{ax_i}{J(\mathbf{m})}} = h^{ax_i} \cdot F(\mathbf{m})^{\tilde{r}}$$

and $\sigma_2 = g^{r - (ax_i)/J(\mathbf{m})} = g^{\tilde{r}}$.

After polynomially many queries, $\mathcal{A}_1$ comes up with a message, that was never queried for signature for any signer, and index $i^* \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ and a forgery

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma^{(L)*} &= (\sigma_0^*, \dots, \sigma_{2L-1}^*) \\ &= (h^{ax_{i^*}t_1^* \dots t_{L-1}^*} \cdot F(\mathbf{m})^{r^*}, g^{r^*}, g^{ax_{i^*}t_1^* \dots t_{L-1}^*}, g^{ax_{i^*}t_1^* \dots t_{L-2}^*}, \\ &\quad \dots, g^{ax_{i^*}t_1^*}, g^{t_1^*}, \dots, g^{t_{L-1}^*}) \in \mathbb{G}^{2L}\end{aligned}$$

at level L . At this stage, $\mathcal{B}_1$ fails if $J(\mathbf{m}^*) \neq 0 \bmod p$. Otherwise, if $\sigma^{(L)*}$ is valid,

$$\sigma_0^* = h^{ax_{i^*}t_1^* \dots t_{L-1}^*} \cdot g^{r^*K(\mathbf{m}^*)}$$

which provides $\mathcal{B}_1$ with a valid $(2L-1)$ -uple

$$\begin{aligned}&(C_1, \dots, C_{L-1}, D_1^a, \dots, D_{L-1}^a, D_{L-1}^{ab}) \\ &= \left(\sigma_{L+1}^*, \dots, \sigma_{2L-1}^*, \sigma_{L+1}^{*1/x_{i^*}}, \dots, \sigma_{2L-1}^{*1/x_{i^*}}, \left(\frac{\sigma_0^*}{\sigma_1^{*K(\mathbf{m}^*)}} \right)^{1/x_{i^*}} \right) \\ &= (g^{t_1^*}, \dots, g^{t_{L-1}^*}, g^{at_1^*}, \dots, g^{at_{L-1}^*}, g^{t_1^* \dots t_{L-1}^* ab}).\end{aligned}$$

A completely similar analysis to [27] shows that $J(\mathbf{m}^*) = 0$ with probability $1/4q_s(n+1)$, which yields the bound on $\mathcal{B}_1$'s advantage.

Delegatee security. A delegatee security adversary $\mathcal{A}_2$ also implies a breach in the $(L-1)$ -FlexDH assumption. The simulator $\mathcal{B}_2$ is given $(A = g^a, B = g^b)$ and uses a strategy that is completely analogous to the one of simulator $\mathcal{B}_1$ in the proof of limited proxy security.

System parameters and public keys: $\mathcal{B}_2$ prepares public parameters exactly as in the proof of limited proxy security. The public key of the target user is defined as $X_0 = A = g^a$. The attacker $\mathcal{A}_2$ must be provided with private keys for all the delegators of that user. For $i = 1, \dots, n$, other public keys are therefore chosen as $X_i = g^{x_i}$ for randomly picked $x_i \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p^*$. The adversary $\mathcal{A}_2$ then receives $\{g, h = B, \bar{u}, X_0 = g^a, x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ as well as re-signature keys R_{ij} for $i \in \{0, \dots, N\}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. These are set as $R_{0j} = A^{1/x_j} = g^{a/x_j}$ and $R_{ij} = g^{x_i/x_j}$ if $i \neq 0$.

Signing queries: for all signers $i \neq 0$, $\mathcal{A}_2$ can generate signatures on her own. When a signature of the target signer is requested for a message $\mathbf{m}$, $\mathcal{B}_2$ proceeds as $\mathcal{B}_1$ did when facing the limited proxy adversary $\mathcal{A}_1$. It fails if $J(\mathbf{m}) = 0 \bmod p$ and can answer the query otherwise.

When $\mathcal{A}_2$ eventually outputs a forgery $(\sigma_0^*, \dots, \sigma_{2L-1}^*)$ at level L , $\mathcal{B}_2$ is successful if $J(\mathbf{m}^*) = 0$ and extracts an admissible $(2L-1)$ -uple as $\mathcal{B}_1$ did.

Delegator security. A delegator security adversary $\mathcal{A}_3$ having advantage ε after q_s signing queries is finally shown to imply an algorithm $\mathcal{B}_3$ to solve a problem which is equivalent (under linear time reduction) to the mCDH problem with probability $\varepsilon/4q_s(n+1)$. Given $(g, A = g^a, A' = g^{1/a}, B = g^b)$, this problem is to find out g^{ab} .

Public parameters and public key generation: Again, system parameters are prepared as in the proof of limited proxy security. Namely, $\mathcal{B}_3$ defines $h = B = g^b$ and chooses $u', u_1, \dots, u_n$ so as to have $F(\mathbf{m}) = h^{J(\mathbf{m})} \cdot g^{K(\mathbf{m})}$ for some functions $J, K : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_p$ where J cancels with non-negligible probability. The public key of the target delegator is set as $X_0 = A = g^a$. For $i = 1, \dots, n$, remaining public keys are set as $X_i = g^{x_i}$ for a random $x_i \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p^*$. The adversary $\mathcal{A}_3$ receives $\{g, h = B, \bar{u}, X_0 = g^a, x_1, \dots, x_n\}$. This time, she is provided with *all* re-signature keys (including R_{0j} and R_{j0}) and attempts to produce a first level forgery. For pairs (i, j) such that $i, j \neq 0$, $\mathcal{B}_3$ sets $R_{ij} = g^{x_i/x_j}$. If $i = 0$, it defines $R_{0j} = A^{1/x_j} = g^{a/x_j}$. If $j = 0$ (and thus $i \neq 0$), $\mathcal{B}_3$ calculates $R_{i0} = A'^{x_i} = g^{x_i/a}$ and hands $\{R_{ij}\}_{i,j}$ to $\mathcal{A}_3$.

Signing queries: when $\mathcal{A}_3$ asks for a signature from the target delegator for a message $\mathbf{m}$, $\mathcal{B}_3$ fails if $J(\mathbf{m}) = 0 \bmod p$ and can answer the query exactly as in the proof of limited proxy security otherwise.

Eventually, $\mathcal{A}_3$ produces a first level forgery $\sigma^{(1)*} = (\sigma_1^*, \sigma_2^*)$ for a message $\mathbf{m}^*$ that was never queried for signature. If $J(\mathbf{m}^*) \neq 0$, $\mathcal{B}_3$ fails. Otherwise, given that $(\sigma_1^*, \sigma_2^*) = (h^a \cdot g^{rK(\mathbf{m}^*)}, g^r)$, $\mathcal{B}_3$ finds out $g^{ab} = \sigma_1^* / \sigma_2^{*K(\mathbf{m}^*)}$.

External Security. We consider an adversary $\mathcal{A}_4$ with advantage ε . We describe an algorithm $\mathcal{B}_4$ solving a $(L-1)$ -FlexDH instance ($A = g^a, B = g^b$) with probability $\varepsilon / (4N(q_s + q_{rs})(n+1))$ within comparable time, where q_s and q_{rs} are the number of signing and re-signing queries.

System parameters: The simulator $\mathcal{B}_4$ prepares common public parameters as in the limited proxy security proof. In addition, it picks at random an integer $i^* \in \{1, \dots, N\}$.

Public key generation: when $\mathcal{A}_4$ asks for the creation of user $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, $\mathcal{B}_4$ responds

- with a newly generated public key $X_i = g^{x_i}$, for a random $x_i \xleftarrow{R} \mathbb{Z}_p^*$ if $i \neq i^*$ (s.t. x_i , user i 's private key, is known to the simulator);
- with $X_{i^*} = A$ if $i = i^*$ (which virtually defines user i 's private key as a).

Oracle queries: $\mathcal{A}_4$'s queries are tackled with as follows.

- *Signing queries:* when a signature of signer i is queried for a message $\mathbf{m}$,
 - $\mathcal{B}_4$ uses its knowledge of x_i to produce the signature if $i \neq i^*$;
 - $\mathcal{B}_4$ uses the simulation from the limited proxy security proof if $i = i^*$ (and therefore fails if $J(\mathbf{m}) = 0 \bmod p$).
- *Re-signing queries:* for such a query on input $(\mathbf{m}, \sigma^{(\ell)}, i, j)$, $\mathcal{B}_4$ checks if $\sigma^{(\ell)}$ is a valid ℓ^{th} level signature on $\mathbf{m}$ for some $\ell \in \{1, \dots, L-1\}$ with respect to the public key i . If yes, $\mathcal{B}_4$ produces a first level signature on $\mathbf{m}$ for user j (using the previous simulation strategy), increases its level up to $\ell+1$ (for the same public key) using the re-signing algorithm (with re-signature key simply equal to g) and outputs the resulting $(\ell+1)^{\text{th}}$ level signature. The simulation only fails if $J(\mathbf{m}) = 0 \bmod p$ and $j = i^*$.

After polynomially many queries, $\mathcal{A}_4$ comes up with a message $\mathbf{m}^*$, an index $j^* \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ and a forgery $\sigma^{(L)*} \in \mathbb{G}^{2L}$ at level L . Recall that $\mathbf{m}^*$ cannot have been queried to signer j^* . Again, $\mathcal{B}_4$ fails if $J(\mathbf{m}^*) \neq 0 \bmod p$ or $j^* \neq i^*$. Otherwise, if $\sigma^{(L)*}$ is valid, $\mathcal{B}_4$ produces a valid $(L-1)$ -FlexDH-tuple as in the limited proxy security proof. A completely similar analysis to this proof ends up with the announced bound on $\mathcal{B}_4$'s advantage. $\square$

6 Conclusions and Open Problems

We described the first multi-use unidirectional proxy re-signatures, which solves a problem left open in 2005. The random-oracle-based proposal also offers efficiency improvements over existing solutions at the first level. The other scheme additionally happens to be the first unidirectional PRS in the standard model.

Two major open problems remain. First, it would be interesting to see if multi-level unidirectional PRS have efficient realizations under more classical intractability assumptions. A perhaps more challenging task would be to find out implementations of such primitives where the size of signatures and the verification cost grow sub-linearly with the number of translations.

References

1. M. Abe, S. Fehr. Perfect NIZK with Adaptive Soundness. In *TCC'07, LNCS* 4392, pages 118–136. Springer, 2007.
2. J.-H. An, Y. Dodis, and T. Rabin. On the security of joint signature and encryption. In *Eurocrypt'02, LNCS* 2332, pages 83–107. Springer, 2002.
3. G. Ateniese, K. Fu, M. Green, S. Hohenberger. Improved Proxy Re-Encryption Schemes with Applications to Secure Distributed Storage. In *NDSS*, 2005.
4. G. Ateniese, K. Fu, M. Green, S. Hohenberger. Improved Proxy Re-Encryption Schemes with Applications to Secure Distributed Storage. In *ACM TISSEC*, 9(1): pp. 1–30, 2006.
5. G. Ateniese, S. Hohenberger. Proxy re-signatures: new definitions, algorithms, and applications. In *ACM CCS'05*, pages 310–319, ACM Press, 2005
6. M. Bellare, A. Palacio: The knowledge-of-exponent assumptions and 3-round zero-knowledge protocols. Proc. of Crypto'04, Springer LNCS Vol. 3152, 273–289 (2004)
7. M. Bellare, P. Rogaway. Random oracles are practical: A paradigm for designing efficient protocols. In *ACM CCS'93*, pages 62–73, ACM Press, 1993.
8. M. Blaze, G. Bleumer, M. Strauss. Divertible Protocols and Atomic Proxy Cryptography. In *Eurocrypt'98, LNCS* 1403, pages 127–144, 1998.
9. A. Boldyreva, A. Palacio, B. Warinschi. Secure Proxy Signature Schemes for Delegation of Signing Rights. Cryptology ePrint Archive: Report 2003/096, 2003.
10. D. Boneh, X. Boyen. Efficient selective-ID secure identity based encryption without random oracles. In *Eurocrypt'04, LNCS* 3027, pp. 223–238. Springer, 2004.
11. D. Boneh, B. Lynn, H. Shacham. Short signatures from the Weil pairing. In *Asiacrypt'01*, volume 2248 of *LNCS*, pages 514–532. Springer, 2002.
12. R. Canetti, S. Hohenberger. Chosen-Ciphertext Secure Proxy Re-Encryption. In *ACM CCS'07*. pages 185–194. ACM Press, 2007.
13. J.-S. Coron. On the exact security of Full Domain Hash. In *Crypto'00*, volume 1880 of *LNCS*, pages 229–235. Springer, 2000.
14. I. Damgård: Towards Practical Public Key Systems Secure Against Chosen Ciphertext Attacks. Proc. of Crypto'91, Springer LNCS Vol. 576, 445–456 (1991)
15. A. Dent. The Hardness of the DHK Problem in the Generic Group Model. Cryptology ePrint Archive: report 2006/156, 2006.
16. Y. Dodis, A.-A. Ivan. Proxy Cryptography Revisited. In *NDSS'03*, 2003.
17. M. Green, G. Ateniese. Identity-Based Proxy Re-encryption. In *ACNS'07, LNCS* 4521, pages 288–306. Springer, 2007.
18. S. Hohenberger. Advances in Signatures, Encryption, and E-Cash from Bilinear Groups. Ph.D. Thesis, MIT, May 2006.
19. S. Hohenberger, G. N. Rothblum, a. shelat, V. Vaikuntanathan. Securely Obfuscating Re-encryption. In *TCC'07, LNCS* 4392, pages 233–252. Springer, 2007.
20. S. Kunz-Jacques, D. Pointcheval. About the Security of MTI/C0 and MQV. In *SCN'06, LNCS* 4116, pages 156–172, Springer, 2006.
21. S. Lu, R. Ostrovsky, A. Sahai, H. Shacham, B. Waters. Sequential Aggregate Signatures and Multisignatures Without Random Oracles. In *Eurocrypt'06*, volume 4004 of *LNCS*, pages 465–485, Springer, 2006.
22. T. Malkin, S. Obana and M. Yung. The Hierarchy of Key Evolving Signatures and a Characterization of Proxy Signatures. In *Eurocrypt'04*, volume 3027 of *LNCS*, pages 306–322, Springer, 2004.
23. M. Mambo, K. Usuda, E. Okamoto. Proxy Signatures for Delegating Signing Operation. In *ACM CCS'96*, pages 48–57. ACM Press, 1996.
24. M. Naor. On Cryptographic Assumptions and Challenges. In *Crypto'03, LNCS* 2729 pages 96–109. Springer-Verlag, 2003.
25. J. Shao, Z. Cao, L. Wang, X. Liang. Proxy Re-Signature Schemes without Random Oracles. In *Indocrypt'07, LNCS* 4859, pages 197–209. Springer, 2007.
26. C. P. Schnorr. Efficient identification and signatures for smart cards. In *Crypto'89*, volume 435 of *LNCS*, pages 239–252. Springer, 1989.
27. B. Waters. Efficient Identity-Based Encryption Without Random Oracles. In *Eurocrypt'05, LNCS* 3494, pages 114–127. Springer 2005.

A Generic hardness of ℓ -FlexDH in bilinear groups

To provide more confidence in the ℓ -FlexDH assumption we prove a lower bound on the computational complexity of the ℓ -FlexDH problem for generic groups equipped with bilinear maps. In [20], Kunz-Jacques and Pointcheval define a family of computational problems that enables to study variants of the CDH problem in the generic group model. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an adversary in this model and $\varphi(X_1, \dots, X_k, Y_1, \dots, Y_\ell)$ be a multivariate polynomial whose coefficients might depend on $\mathcal{A}$'s behaviour. For values of $x_1, \dots, x_k$ chosen by the simulator, and knowing their encodings, the goal of $\mathcal{A}$ is to compute the encodings of $y_1, \dots, y_\ell$ such that

$$\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_k, y_1, \dots, y_\ell) = 0.$$

All elements manipulated by $\mathcal{A}$ are linear polynomials in $x_1, \dots, x_k$ and some new random elements introduced through the group oracle. Let us denote P_i the polynomial corresponding to y_i (it is a random variable), Kunz-Jacques and Pointcheval proved the following result.

Theorem 3 ([20]). *Let $d = \deg(\varphi)$ and P_m be an upper bound for the probability*

$$\Pr[\varphi(X_1, \dots, X_k, P_1(X_1, \dots, X_k), \dots, P_\ell(X_1, \dots, X_k)) = 0]$$

Then the probability that $\mathcal{A}$ wins after q_G queries satisfies

$$\text{Succ}(q_G) \leq P_m + \frac{(3q_G + k + 2)}{2p} + \frac{d}{p}.$$

The choice $\phi(X_1, X_2, Y_1, \dots, Y_{\ell+1}) = Y_{\ell+1} - X_1 X_2 Y_1 \dots Y_\ell$ implies the generic hardness of the problem ℓ -FlexDH in groups. The purpose of this section is to prove that Kunz-Jacques and Pointcheval result also holds in generic bilinear groups and therefore that the problem ℓ -FlexDH is intractable in these groups.

Theorem 4. *Let $d = \deg(\varphi)$ and P_m be an upper bound for the probability*

$$\Pr[\varphi(X_1, \dots, X_k, P_1(X_1, \dots, X_k), \dots, P_\ell(X_1, \dots, X_k)) = 0]$$

Then the probability that $\mathcal{A}$ wins after q_G oracle queries to the group operations in $\mathbb{G}$, $\mathbb{G}_T$ to the bilinear map e satisfies

$$\text{Succ}(q_G) \leq P_m + \frac{(3q_G + k + 2)}{p} + \frac{d}{p}.$$

Proof. In the following I and I_T , denote the set $\{0, \dots, p-1\}$ and are used to represent elements of $\mathbb{G}$ and $\mathbb{G}_T$ respectively. Following [20], in the generic bilinear group model, an adversary $\mathcal{A}$ has access to

- an oracle $\mathfrak{G}$ that, on input $(a, b, r, r') \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \times I^2$, answers with the representation of $ax + bx'$ in I , where r is the representation of x and r' the representation of x' .
- an oracle $\mathfrak{G}_T$ that, on input $(a, b, r, r') \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \times I_T^2$, answers with the representation of $ax + bx'$ in I_T , where r is the representation of x and r' the representation of x' .
- an oracle $\mathfrak{E}$ that, on input $(a, b, r, r') \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \times I^2$, answers with the representation of $ax + bx'$ in I_T , where r is the representation of x and r' the representation of x' .

The connection between representations and elements of $\mathbb{Z}_p$ is managed by the simulator through two lists $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{L}_T$ of pairs (x, r) associating an element with its representation. A representation r in an oracle query input does not need to correspond to an element of $\mathbb{Z}_p$ in $\mathcal{L}$ or $\mathcal{L}_G$; if it does, the corresponding element is used, otherwise a random element x is drawn by the simulator in $\mathbb{Z}_p$ and bound to r , that is, (x, r) is added to $\mathcal{L}$ or $\mathcal{L}_G$. The same rule applies for the answer to the query: if $ax + bx' = x''$ with (x'', r'') in $\mathcal{L}$ or $\mathcal{L}_G$, r'' is answered. Otherwise, a random representation r'' , is chosen and (x'', r'') is added to $\mathcal{L}$ or $\mathcal{L}_G$, and the answer to the oracle query is r'' . Overall, each oracle query adds at most 3 pairs to $\mathcal{L}$ or $\mathcal{L}_G$.

For our problem, initially we have

$$\mathcal{L} = \{(0, r_z), (1, re), (x_1, r_1), \dots, (x_k, r_k)\} \text{ and } \mathcal{L}_T = \emptyset$$

and $\mathcal{A}$ is given $r_z, r_e, r_1, \dots, r_k$. $\mathcal{A}$'s goal is to output $r'_1, \dots, r'_\ell$ corresponding to $y_1, \dots, y_\ell$ in $\mathbb{Z}_p$ that, together with the x_i 's, cancel φ . The last queries of $\mathcal{A}$ are assumed to be of the form $\mathfrak{G}(1, 0, r'_i, r_e)$. $\mathcal{A}$ has won if $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_k, y_1, \dots, y_\ell) = 0$ where $(y_i, r'_i) \in \mathcal{L}$.

To prove the generic hardness of the problem, we consider a simulator S' where random values in $\mathbb{Z}_p$ are replaced by formal unknowns X_i . Represents of elements of $\mathbb{G}$ (*resp.* $\mathbb{G}_T$) correspond to linear combinations (*resp.* quadratic polynomials) of these unknowns with coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}_p$. The simulation is similar to the one given in [20] and $\mathcal{A}$'s goal is to output $r'_1, \dots, r'_\ell$ corresponding to linear polynomials $P_1, \dots, P_\ell$ in $\mathbb{Z}_p[X_1, \dots, X, \dots]$ that, together with the unknowns X_i 's, cancel φ .

The difference between $\mathcal{A}$'s success probability in the two simulation occurs only if S' 's simulation, the representations of different polynomials (linear or quadratic) P_1 and P_2 collide in S' 's simulation. The number of polynomials in $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{L}_T$ is upper-bounded by $3q_G + k + 2$ and their degrees is at most two. Therefore, the difference appears with probability at most $(3q_G + k + 2)^2/p$. As in [20], the success criterion in S' 's simulation is stricter than in S 's simulation and as above the probability that $\mathcal{A}$ succeeds in S 's simulation but not in S' 's simulation is upper-bounded by d/p (since φ is of degree d and the P_i 's are linear polynomial). $\square$